

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VIII

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 31, 1914

No. 5

That Xenophon is an interesting and attractive writer, at least in his *Anabasis*, has more than once been urged in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*; witness Dr. Guernsey's paper on Elements of Interest in the *Anabasis*, 3.66-69, and the enthusiastic utterances in the extract printed in 6.215 from George Gissing: *The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft*. Such papers as these are happy answers to those who find Xenophon *dull.

In *The Nation* for January 29, 1914, there was a brief but highly complimentary review of an important work on Xenophon, entitled *L'Anabase de Xénophon, avec un Commentaire historique et militaire*, by Colonel Arthur Boucher. The work contains 48 maps and plans, and 400 pages, folio, of letter-press (Paris: Berger-Leorault. 25 francs). This work is by an ardent admirer of Xenophon, and forms a vigorous answer to those who have questioned the veracity of Xenophon's story. Prominent among such doubters have been Colonel Mure, in his *Critical History of the Language and Literature of the Greeks*, Mahaffy, in his chapter on Xenophon in his *History of Classical Greek Literature*, and a German officer, General von Hoffmeister, in his *Durch Armenien und der Zug Xenophons* (Leipzig, 1911).

Parts of the review are here reproduced:

In the days of the American small college three books of Xenophon's *Anabasis* were universally required in the quantum of Greek which was thought essential to a liberal education. Alexander the Great learned the art of war in Xenophon. Napoleon quoted him. Gen. Février, who has been the great tactician of the French army in recent years, replied to questions: "You will find it in Xenophon—the only master I have had". . . . What with old and new college students, with military students desirous of going through a praxis followed by leaders of armies for more than two thousand years, with readers of history who wish to know if Grote's admiration of Xenophon is justified, with those who are interested in countries which Turkey's disasters are opening at last, this very painstaking translation and commentary of a superior French officer, already known for his studies of Greek tactics and German strategies, should not lack a public. For the Greek professor, for the reference table of students even not advanced, it is a godsend.

In the minute introduction there is a statement of the historical questions involved, with a table of the marches from place to place, day by day, in parasangs and kilometres. Besides the aid furnished by geographers like Richard Kiepert and Felix Oswald, by men on the ground, like Prince Engalitschiff and the

Governor-General of Erivan, our commentator has had the unique collaboration of a Dominican missionary who—the first in modern times—has made reconnoissances of the difficult mountain region in what is still unknown Turkey. A complete analysis follows of military questions exemplified in Xenophon's account and their use in modern manoeuvres.

The translation (the Greek text is not given) has been made in literal and very readable French, with particular reference to military exactness. Each chapter, according to the divisions of the Teubner edition revised by Gemoll, is followed by its commentary. Thus, as a sample of its richness and completeness, the second chapter is accompanied by an analysis of the Greek forces; a map with description of the route and a road-sketch from Ramsay; a valuation of the length of the parasang in Xenophon and Herodotus, compared with actual measurements in kilometres; days' marches estimated by time; a table of the troops under review in separate divisions by commanders; a full explanation of the military organization of the Greeks and their formation in battle; and their order of encampment with the Persian troops of Cyrus, with plan. Perhaps not a single point of the text of Xenophon, which is a journal of march as well as a history, is neglected, down to the point where the retreating Greeks take to the sea, which calls forth an explanation of "ships in use at the time of the Ten Thousand". The conclusion is:

"The *Anabasis* is a veritable monument from the historical and geographical point of view;

It is also one of the most beautiful and exact books of war left us by past centuries;

And it is one which men of war, especially today, have most interest to meditate upon and to apply its teachings".

C. K.

THE DIVINE CHARACTER OF THE REX SACRORUM¹

The study of anthropology, and more especially, of comparative religion, has in recent years brought out some concepts of gods so unlike those entertained by civilized peoples that it requires no little effort to adjust the mind and imagination to their reception. Various theories have been put forth to account for man's first conception of divinity. I begin with that which is advanced by Mr. Allen in his *Evolution of the Idea of God*. This may perhaps best be introduced by an anecdote which Mr. Allen tells (page 271) of Sir Richard Burton. The great Orientalist was exploring a remote Mohammedan region, and, in order

¹This paper was read at the Eighth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Barnard College, April 18, 1914.

to have greater freedom, disguised himself as a fakir of Islam. So successful was he in playing the part of holy man, that he inspired in the people a great reverence for his sanctity. But one night a chief of the village came to him secretly and urged him to flee if he valued his life. The explorer was much surprised, in view of the influence which he had gained among the superstitious natives. But it was this very religious awe which, as the friendly chief explained, was the source of danger: the people were planning to slay their spiritual master for the laudable purpose of retaining his tomb among them as a shrine. The warning gave this Lord Longbow barely time to escape an undesirable apotheosis. Whether or not this story is true (Mr. Allen refuses to vouch for it), it furnishes a good example of the process of manufacturing gods. According to Mr. Allen's theory, deities have developed from dead men, some of whom died naturally and others of whom their tribesmen slew for the purpose of deifying them. Of course, the manufacturing of divinity by human sacrifice was the invention of a later civilization than was the simple worship of men who had died in the ordinary course of nature. Because the people expected to receive benefits from the deified members of their tribe, the thought at some time entered their minds that it might be advantageous to dispatch occasionally to the powerful company of spirits a special representative from among the living, for, on account of his recent experience of their need, he would make a greater effort in their behalf. The good will of the intended victim they could easily gain beforehand by bestowing on him plentiful gifts and honors. Cases are actually known of such indulged persons departing life willingly when their time was up. This custom merely hastened the deification of those who were potentially gods.

Professor Frazer gives interesting evidence of the origin of a second sort of divinity. He has taken as the starting point of his two great works, *The Golden Bough* and *Lectures on the Early History of the Kingship*, the strange cult in the grove at Nemi near Aricia. He begins thus (*The Golden Bough*, 1.2 ff.):

In this sacred grove there grew a certain tree round which a grim figure might be seen to prowl. In his hand he carried a drawn sword, and he kept peering warily about him as if every instant he expected to be set upon by an enemy. He was a priest and a murderer; and the man for whom he looked was sooner or later to murder him and hold the priesthood in his stead. Such was the rule of the sanctuary. A candidate could succeed to office only by slaying the priest. . . . The post which he held by this precarious tenure carried with it the title of king.

This is the situation effectively presented in Macaulay's famous verses:

The still glassy lake that sleeps
Beneath Aricia's trees—
Those trees in whose dim shadow
The ghastly priest doth reign,
The priest that slew the slayer,
And shall himself be slain.

After collecting a great mass of evidence for the existence of customs similar to this among many different tribes and nations both of the past and the present, Professor Frazer comes to the conclusion that gods developed from kings. These kings were originally magicians whose most important duty was that of controlling the weather by sympathetic magic. This magical power which they professed to exercise, often making the claim with perfect sincerity, gradually raised them in the eyes of their subjects to the rank of gods. They were propitiated with gifts, they were surrounded with taboos and other safeguards to their divinity. If they were well, the land would be fruitful; if they were injured, vegetation would fail and the flocks would cease to multiply. It was in accordance with this line of reasoning that the people conceived the strange idea of slaying their king-gods while they were still in the prime of life, so that their successors might inherit the divine essence unimpaired by old age or disease. Among some nations the rulers seem to have been slain at stated intervals, among others, whenever circumstances might seem to require it. It is easily seen that the two theories, those of Mr. Allen and of Professor Frazer, overlap to some extent, since in both cases the slain victim was already or potentially a deity.

A better known theory of the development of the religious sense in the Romans is that which has been lucidly and conveniently given by Professor Carter in his *Religion of Numa*. He supposes that in very remote antiquity the simple peasants of the Palatine Hill conceived of all the objects about them as animated by vague spirits or *numina*. These were not personifications; they were, on the contrary, so intangible as to lack name or sex, as is shown by the well-known formula, *sive deus sive dea*. Some of them, however, gradually did gain name and personality; and so, partly under Greek influence, attained the rank of deities.

We see, therefore, that these several factors were perhaps at work in the creation of the Roman gods. Whether the three sorts came into existence at the same time or at different times, and whether side by side, or in different localities, is hard, perhaps impossible, to determine. We are dealing, at any rate, in each instance, with a very old notion. Among divinities that came from deified ancestors we may mention the *Manes*. An example of a god developing from an incarnate king is probably Jupiter. Finally Janus and Vesta seem to have joined the heavenly hierarchy after having been first the spirits indwelling in certain material things.

After this introduction, in which the second theory is the important one for our present purpose, we pass to our specific problem, which is to show that the ancient king of the Romans was an incarnation of Jupiter, and that, consequently, the *rex sacrorum*, who inherited some of his duties, must have been a priest of Jupiter and not of Janus, as has been hitherto maintained.

Now, as other primitive nations had king-gods of the kind just mentioned, it seems probable that, at a similar stage of their civilization, the Romans also had kings of the same sort. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that, as Professor Frazer has explained, such kings existed even so near to Rome as Nemi. Moreover, the traditions current among the Romans about the deification of Romulus show that the idea of a divine ruler was not repugnant to them; and the ease with which the cult of the deified emperors was established was due, not to the arrogance and power of these imperial beings themselves, but to the fact that the germ of this sort of worship had always lain dormant in the hearts of the people, ready to grow under favorable circumstances. It is a significant thing that Julius Caesar was worshipped by the common people soon after his death, and that Augustus was considered a god even during his lifetime. Ideas of this sort do not spring up out of nothing in so brief a period.

The existence at Rome of a divine kingship is suggested also by the Regifugium. This was a ceremony occurring early in the morning of February 24; the *rex sacrorum* performed a sacrifice in the Comitium and then at once fled. The Romans thought that this speedy departure commemorated the flight of the Tarquins, which took place when these tyrants were driven from the city. This explanation is too obviously made up to fit the name. The true reason must lie deeper in the nature of sacrifice. Professor Robertson Smith², from data too copious to be presented here, deduces the law that the victim slain in honor of a god was originally that deity himself. If this is true, the animal killed at the Regifugium represented some divinity. But why did the *rex* himself flee so swiftly after the sacrifice? Was it because it was a sacrilege to slay a god? If this were so, why did not all priests run away after performing similar rites? Is it not really much more probable that, although this victim, in accordance with Professor Smith's law, was a deity, yet it was not from the consequences of the sacrilegious slaughter that the priest-king fled, but that the *rex sacrorum*, like the primitive kings already mentioned, was himself originally both the deity and the victim, "a god self slain on his own strange altar"? He, then, felt a particular necessity for flight, if he would avoid an untimely death. Perhaps some crafty old king, on perceiving that the time was come when he must pay for the privileges enjoyed during his reign, repaired in secret to the place set for his very literal self-sacrifice, slew a sheep, and fled, leaving it on the altar as a substitute for himself. It must have been comparatively easy to persuade his superstitious subjects that the gods had accepted the animal, or even that they had provided it themselves. Having once found that no evil consequences followed the sacrifice of a beast instead of a man, a people who were

so far advanced in civilization as to be averse to the slaughter of an innocent human being would be likely to continue the vicarious sacrifice. The ram which Abraham found caught in the thicket and "offered up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son" will immediately occur to the mind as an example of such a substitution. Indeed, in this instance the patriarch had expressly said, "God will provide himself a ram for a burnt offering". In one version of the story of Iphigenia, the goddess Diana, at the last moment, put a hind in the place of the maiden. Even modern times have furnished a remarkably similar instance. In India, since the British government has forbidden men and women to commit suicide under the wheels of the juggernaut, the worshippers have been throwing cocoanuts in its path, during the annual procession, with entire satisfaction to themselves and apparently to the gods, whose triumphal car, even within the memory of our fathers, was yearly spattered with the blood of many men, women and children. In Rome, then, once the *rex* had slain his victim and fled, he would always perform the act in the same way. In consequence of this, the sacrifice of the Regifugium continued to take place very early in the morning, before the people were stirring; and in more cultivated times the *rex sacrorum* fled in imitation of that fear which had inspired the primitive king.

The next question to consider is, What god was thus incarnated in the priest-king? In the examples given by Professor Frazer, the rulers who attained to this unenviable godhead were always magicians whose influence extended especially over the weather. Now, the Roman god of the sky and of rain was, of course, Jupiter. Therefore it seems entirely probable that the early king, the descendant of the rain-making magician, was a human Jupiter. If so, this god Jupiter had been an earthly ruler who became etherialized into a real divinity, whereas the king who originally was the god himself became merely his viceregent on earth. Perhaps some of the stories associated with the priestly Numa may be reminiscences of the magical relation between him and the weather god. One such tale is the following³: The pious monarch, by the recitation of a certain formula, brought Jupiter down from the sky. He then inquired of the Thunderer what propitiatory offering he desired, when he hurled his bolts against mankind. 'A head must be cut off', said the god; 'Of an onion', Numa agrees. 'Of a man', the deity insists; 'The topmost hairs', retorts the king. Jupiter repeats his demand, 'A life must be sacrificed'; 'Yes, of a fish', assents the ever-compliant Numa. Seeing the uselessness of continuing the argument with so clever a controversialist, Jupiter yielded, and, from that time on, these were the offerings that the Romans made for lightning. Besides showing the magical relationship between Numa and the god of thunder, this story incidentally gives another example

²Encyclopaedia Britannica, in the article Sacrifice.

³Ovid, Fasti 3.263-373; Plutarch, Numa 15.

of the mitigation of a human sacrifice to that of an animal, or even a vegetable. Furthermore, according to Plutarch⁴, Numa instituted and took part in certain 'sacrifices and dances' in order to secure the aid of the gods. These ceremonies were probably magical practices, somewhat like the dances of the 'medicine men' among our own American Indians.

We pass now to another bit of evidence for my general theory: King Latinus became Jupiter Latiaris after his death⁵, and Aeneas was deified as Jupiter Indiges⁶. This strengthens the likelihood that these kings really had been Jupiters even during their lifetime. It is true that Romulus, after his apotheosis, was called Quirinus, not Jupiter; but it is possible, as Mr. A. B. Cook⁷ has pointed out, that this name may be connected with Jupiter's oak, and that the full name of the first king of Rome, after he reached Heaven, was Jupiter Quirinus. In that case, Quirinus was the only part of the name that survived. At any rate, Jupiter had had his share in the deification of Romulus, for he took him to the sky during a thunder storm⁸. Furthermore, a passage from Plautus⁹, quoted by Professor Frazer, shows that the idea of human Jupiters was sufficiently familiar to be used even in a popular play. An old man says to a slave, 'I'll be your Jupiter, and so long as I am propitious, you need not care a straw for these lesser gods'. 'That's all nonsense', retorts the slave, 'as if you did not know how human Jupiters die a sudden death. When you are a dead Jupiter, and your kingdom has passed to others, who will there be to protect me?' This may, of course, be borrowed from the Greeks, from whom Plautus drew most of his material; but he would hardly have used it unless there had been something in Roman customs or traditions, enough like it to make it intelligible to his audience. It is entirely reasonable to suppose that the reference is to a ceremony at some nearer place, such as Nemi, or that it is a conception native to Rome. But even if the idea be an imported one, it must be noticed that it is Jupiter, not some other deity, who is chosen as the god who could die.

We should note, too, that, in Roman history and tradition, there is a constant association of Jupiter with kings. He it was who ratified the election of Numa to the sovereignty¹⁰. An eagle, the bird of Jove, foretold to Tarquinius Priscus that he should sit on a throne¹¹, and, when an eagle swooped down and took off Lucumo's cap, he was reconciled to the loss by the reflection that like supremacy awaited him¹². Many examples such as this could be cited. The consistency with which the title *rex* is bestowed on Jupiter, *quem unum omnium deorum et hominum regem esse omnes doctrina expoliti consentiunt*¹³, is an additional indication of his character of king. It is, of course,

possible that the epithet has been borrowed from the Greek Zeus; but if this be so, the fact that he, rather than some other god, was chosen as the counterpart of the Homeric 'king of gods and men', is not without significance. We may add, as further evidence, the statement of Dionysius of Halicarnassus¹⁴ that, at the expulsion of the Tarquins, a *rex sacrorum* was appointed because the name of the royal power came from the gods, and therefore could not be abolished.

Our theory that the king was originally a god on earth is supported by another kind of argument. It is well known that Roman consuls were entitled to the *toga praetexta*, the curule chair, and lictors. All these Romulus is said to have invented as marks of distinction for himself. But we know that they were also the insignia of the god Jupiter, and that the flamen Dialis, his priest, was entitled to them. This tradition must mean, then, that Romulus and the early kings were supposed to have had the attributes of this deity. Moreover, the crown, the chariot and the eagle which gave glory to the triumphal procession of a victorious general also belonged to the Capitoline Jove; and, indeed, Livy¹⁵ expressly states that triumphant generals had the decorations of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. And Laurentius Lydus¹⁶, a late writer, specifies Caesar as riding into the city like a god. Now, if consuls and generals, the flamen Dialis and the *rex sacrorum* performed duties all of which once pertained to an actual king, then their insignia and privileges must also have belonged originally to the person whose powers they had assumed and divided among themselves, that is, to the king. If these insignia and privileges were once the distinguishing marks of a deity, then the king, who formerly bore them all, must have been the representative of that god whose attributes and honors he possessed. If, then, the primitive king was the representative of Jupiter on earth, it follows that the *rex sacrorum*, the survival of the actual ruler, must have been a priest of Jupiter, not of Janus, as has been generally supposed.

There remains to be considered only one line of argument which has been thought to connect the *rex sacrorum* with Janus. In *Fasti* 1.318 Ovid says of January 9, *Ianus agonali luce piandus erit*. In the lines following this, he adds that the *rex sacrorum* sacrificed a ram on that day. This line and the fact that in the Acts of the Arval Brothers a ram is mentioned as the regular sacrifice to Janus have been considered evidence that the first Agonalia of the year was held in honor of Janus, and that the *rex sacrorum*, since he officiated, must have been a priest to Janus, not to Jupiter, as I have been arguing.

Taken by itself, *Ianus piandus erit* would seem to mean that a sacrifice had to be made to Janus. But it is a well known fact that Janus was ordinarily mentioned first in prayers and formulas, and Vesta last,

⁴Numa 8.

⁵Festus 194.

⁶Livy 1.2.6.

⁷Zeus, Jupiter and the Oak, in *The Classical Review*, 18.360 ff.

⁸Livy 1.16.1-5.

⁹Caesina 330-337; Frazer, *Lectures on the Early History of the Kingship*, 282.

¹⁰Livy 1.18.

¹¹Aurelius Victor, *De Viris Illustribus* 6.

¹²Livy 1.34.

¹³Cicero, *De Republica* 1.36.56.

¹⁴4.73-74.

¹⁵10.7.

¹⁶*De Magistratibus* 2.2.3.

so that the phrase 'Janus and Vesta' came to be a synonym for prayer. For example, Juvenal says¹⁷, *Ianum Vestamque rogabat*, and Ovid himself, in addressing Janus, asks, 'Why is it that, no matter which of the gods I am propitiating, I must always make a sacrifice to you first?'¹⁸

These passages suggest that the words 'Janus has to be appeased on the Agonalia' simply mean that a sacrifice has to be made on that day. This interpretation is made almost certain when taken in connection with another passage of the same kind. Of March 27 Ovid¹⁹ says again, 'Janus will have to be honored', *Ianus adorandus . . . erit*, but, in this case, there is no doubt that the part of Janus in the ceremony is a very subordinate one, because the whole reference is,

Ianus adorandus cumque hoc Concordia mitis
et Romana Salus araque Pacis erit.

Clearly, then, this is a celebration held in honor of Concord and Safety and Peace, and yet Ovid begins with *Ianus adorandus*. If March 27 is not sacred to Janus, there is no reason for supposing that January 9 is, for the god is mentioned in exactly the same way on both occasions. To be sure, Ovid does not disclose the name of the deity to whom this first Agonalia of the year is sacred; it is possible, therefore, that the god had been forgotten, though his rite survived, or that the sacrifice was made to the whole company of the great gods of the state, the list which began with Janus and ended with Vesta. As this objection based on Ovid seems hardly tenable, the general conclusion may stand that the Roman king represented Jupiter on earth, and that the *rex sacrorum*, who inherited certain of his functions, was not a priest of Janus, as has always been held, but a priest of Jupiter.

HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS,
PHILADELPHIA.

BESSIE R. BURCHETT.

THE HOUSE OF THE GILDED CUPIDS¹

The house in Pompeii which charmed me most of those I visited is one which few tourists, even classical tourists, seem to enter. Perhaps this is because it is not described in Mau-Kelsey (even in the revised edition), which is the guide for most of us in our walks in Pompeii, and many have not read the account of it in the *Notizie*, or looked at the charming pictures given there². The very name which has been attached to the house since its excavation, Casa degli Amorini dorati, The House of the Gilded Cupids, carries romance with it, and the ruins themselves seem hardly ruins at all: so full are they of atmosphere and of the personality of the owners.

This effect is brought about partly by the fact that most of the paintings and the sculpture found in the house have been left in place, partly by the restoration

of the roof of the peristyle (the red tiles of which give warmth of color to the scene) and by the making of the garden in its center. But also the arrangement of rooms in the house itself is individual and the decorations show strong individual taste on the part of the owners. Word-pictures cannot reproduce the rooms, but may interest travellers to see them for themselves.

In the plan of the house, greater privacy was secured by placing the peristyle not directly behind the atrium, where the wayfarer on the street could get a glimpse of the interior, but at the south-west angle of the atrium, so that no view of it can be obtained from the street. The atrium itself is small, in Tuscan style, with paintings on the rectangular sections of the walls, one now but dimly shadowing Paris on Ida, another, half destroyed, showing a group of men one of whom is labelled Φοίνξ. The base of the wall shows in its upper section a quaint design of a conventionalized walled garden, with amusing birds perched on the wall and attitudinizing in the gates. In the bedrooms on either side of the atrium there are paintings: in one, pictures of Leda, Narcissus, and of flying Cupids, in the other, a flying Mercury. In this second room was found also a herm with a young boy's head at the top. This head is certainly the portrait of a real boy: so very individual are the features. The workmanship is fine art, for the marble is exquisitely painted in realistic coloring. In the room which may be called the *tablinum*, since it connects with both atrium and peristyle, though it does not lie between them in the usual position, there is one wall-painting comparatively well-preserved, showing Paris and Helen at Sparta, with Venus and Cupid in attendance.

The peristyle itself shows a wealth of painting and sculpture. Behind the Doric columns, which are covered with stucco and painted red at the bottom, the walls are divided into great squares covered with a profusion of frescoes of candelabra, flowering branches, architectural vistas, set against a black background. The frieze too shows architectural designs: candelabra, suspended objects like rhyta and baskets, and animal scenes, some pictures of Amorini at the chase. On these peristyle walls there is also another kind of decoration: insets of sculptured reliefs, some showing groups of dramatic masks (of men, women, satyrs), some bearing single dramatic masks; one gives a great figure of a satyr carrying an ivy-crowned thyrsus; another represents a grotto under which stands Venus Pompeiana with a little Eros by her side. In many of these traces of color appear.

Two shrines were found against the walls of the peristyle, one in the southeast corner, one against the north wall. In the first were representations of Egyptian divinities and of objects used in their cult-worship: Anubis, Harpocrates, Isis and Sarapis. In the shrine on the north wall were found statuettes of Jupiter, Juno and Minerva seated on thrones, a seated Mercury and two joyful Lares.

¹⁷6.386.

¹⁸*Fasti* 1.171-172.

¹⁹*Fasti* 3.881-882.

¹This house is officially known as No. 7 in Isola XVI, Regio VI.

²*Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità*, 1906, 374 ff.; 1907, 349 ff.

In the center of the peristyle, there was the usual garden with a *piscina* in the center. Through the garden were scattered marble pilasters richly decorated, bearing rectangular marble slabs with relief work on both sides, marble herms, and statuettes of white marble. The pilasters, although different in detail, have usually on one side a conventionalized tree-trunk bearing an ivy garland, with dramatic masks in the reversed curves formed by the trunk's outlines; on the other side are sea creatures—Poseidon, Tritons, sea-horses, and also Centaurs and Cupids. The sculptured rectangular plinths on top of these pilasters show dramatic masks, Satyrs and Sileni. On the herms are heads of Dionysus, and of Jupiter; two bear portrait heads of darling children. The presence of children in the house may perhaps be attested also by the marble statuettes of animals in the garden placed now where they were found: a little rabbit, a dog, a boar (or dog?) with a dog on its back.

There were found also in the peristyle marble masks and disks with iron rings in the top to hang them up by: masks of a Maenad, of a Satyr, of Silenus, one disk with the relief of a nude youth with a discus, one bearing a Maenad with a knife, two showing centaurs. All these hang as they did originally around the peristyle between the columns, an arrangement which many Pompeian wall-paintings attest, and which is shown in the decoration of a *cubiculum* in this house at the southeast corner of the peristyle, for here the walls bear, as it were, a picture of the peristyle itself, the decoration being painted columns like those of the peristyle with dramatic masks hanging between them. This bedroom has a large window almost the width of its western wall which looks out on a sort of conservatory room between it and the *triclinium*; at least now the room is kept as a little garden with ivy over the walls and with flowerbeds.

The suggestion that the owners loved the charming picture which their peristyle made is given not only by the reproduction of its colonnade around the walls of a bedroom, but by the fact that in the east wall of the peristyle were set two pieces of black glass which served as mirrors and reflected, as one still does, on their lustrous surface, the charming room with the red-roofed portico, the red and white columns, the green plants, the marble pilasters and the herms.

The most attractive bedroom of all is the one off the north portico from which the house took its modern name. In this room, the walls were painted all over in a fine geometric pattern in reds and yellows, and set in this decoration are small, round, gilded medallions, each bearing an exquisite Cupid. The ceiling of the room too was beautifully decorated, as the fragments show.

I have not mentioned the busts of a young woman and a young man that were found in the house. The woman is charmingly pretty and dainty with slender neck and small features. The man has a smooth face,

high-bridged nose, rather thin cheeks with heavy lines, a very strong chin with a slight indentation and a firm, straight mouth with thin lips. His eyes are large and deep-set. The face is one of great character, individuality and interest.

The two faces I believed to be those of the owners of the house; so, standing before them, I pondered. Were the two favored by the Venus of Pompeii and by the Golden Cupids of their bedroom in the happiness of their married life, and did they care for their home as the re-picturing of it suggests? Were the three children represented on the herms their children? Was the man an actor? For surely the wealth of dramatic masks and the representations of Satyrs, Sileni, and Dionysus in the decoration suggested devotion to the drama. And was it the ardent temperament of an actor that made this firm-lipped Pompeian gentleman worship at a shrine to Isis and Sarapis along with his dutiful observation of proper rites to the old Roman triad and the household gods?

The house is alive, and seems ready to answer my questions, but the owners are gone. On the wall of the *andron* there is a broken inscription, a pentameter in the center of which a proper name is apparently lacking:

Quo bibet (= bibit) . . . ossa cinisque tegunt.
Perhaps, after the final catastrophe at Pompeii, some one of the survivors who returned to the desolate city scratched this last word upon the wall of the House of the Gilded Cupids.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT.

REVIEW

The Classical Papers of Mortimer Lamson Earle.

With a Memoir. New York: The Columbia University Press (1912). Pp. xxxii + 298. \$2.50.

The colleagues of the late Professor Mortimer Lamson Earle have done well to bring together the scattered contributions to classical scholarship of that brilliant scholar, their friend and associate at Columbia University, whose early death we still mourn. Long before his death in 1905 the world of scholars at large had recognized in him one of the ablest of American classical philologists; and at home his influence, both as a teacher of exceptional power and as a productive scholar of wide range, profound knowledge, and shrewd critical insight, was great and steadily growing. The assembling between two covers of all his published papers on classical subjects was not needed, therefore, to enhance his reputation at home and abroad. But the volume before us, besides being a generous tribute of admiration and affection offered to the memory of Professor Earle by those who stood nearest to him in his own University, has a significance of its own when considered as a document of American scholarship. From both points of view—as a fitting memorial to a fallen comrade and as, in a sense, a milestone of the progress of classical studies in this country,—this book

deserves a welcome and its projectors our thanks and commendation.

Over eighty notes and articles are included in this volume, the production of 18 years, from 1888 to 1905. All but a few had previously been published in various journals, the only considerable exception being the beginning of a minute critical study of the First Book of Plato's Republic, printed from manuscript on pages 146-154. An Appendix of thirteen pages gives a few poems and translations. The Memoir, written by the late Professor Ashmore, is an intimate account of the life of Professor Earle—somewhat too intimate, indeed, to have been prefixed without editing to a collection of scholarly papers. The frontispiece is an admirable likeness of Professor Earle. The plan and the execution of the volume are in general good. The papers are arranged topically under the heads Greek Authors, Latin Authors, and Greek Grammar, Lexicography, and Archaeology; and a very full Index of passages completes the volume and greatly enhances its practical value. One misses, however, a Table of Contents, which would have been useful.

A count of the titles of Professor Earle's articles shows that over two-thirds of them deal with matters of textual criticism. If we consider their bulk, the proportion is still greater. The contributions to archaeology were written in the author's youth, when the spell of Greece was strong upon him and his activities as a pupil in the American School at Athens forced him to be, for the time, something of an archaeologist. He would have been a first-rate archaeologist had he kept on; but his gifts after all were critical and his training that of the linguist and philologist. His diligent study of the classical writers, which was always his chief preoccupation, and the duties of the position which he accepted on his return from Athens as a teacher of Greek and Latin, naturally turned him to the field of interpretation and criticism, for which his intellectual gifts and attainments best fitted him. The five able studies in the field of Greek Syntax (213-230), the first of which was written in 1892, reveal one aspect of his critical studies in interpretation. But his absorbing interest was in textual criticism, and this centered in the tragic poets. Four critical notes on Sophocles and Euripides appeared as early as 1892, and these two poets occupied him largely until his death. The well-known editions of the *Alcestis* (1896), *Oedipus Tyrannus* (1901), and *Medea* (1904), all characterized by an independent treatment of the text, were preceded and followed by numerous studies of special passages in these two poets and in Aeschylus.

The scholar who devotes himself to the emendation of our classical texts is generally not unaware of the pitfalls that beset his path. The more competent the scholar, the less confident he is likely to be as to the absolute and final character of much of his work. Though he employ the conventional language of the guild of critics, which affects the more positive forms of

assertion, in reality he neither deceives others nor is himself deceived. Solon's homely words apply rather better, in these later days, to the healer of texts than to the healer of bodies, τοῖς οὐδὲν ἔκαστι τέλος. But, in spite of the hazard, the likelihood that he will not attain either by reasoning or by divination to the τέλος of the critical art, the ipsissima verba of his author, and the possibility that he may even apply the knife to a perfectly sound body, every scholar who strives to penetrate into the thought of an ancient author is bound to be a textual critic. At the point where his own understanding fails he must inevitably reckon with the possibility of a fault in the tradition. He will be a good critic or a poor one according to his mastery of the language, his ability to think straight and to think as the ancients thought, his knowledge of the processes by which the ancient texts have been transmitted to our times, and the degree to which he possesses the gift of insight and invention. Keenly alive to all the possibilities of corruption, he must be quick to suspect and shrewd to discover the nature of it and its probable seat. The larger half of the critic's work is done when he has demonstrated that a passage as it stands in our MSS could not have been written by the author. But he should be equally ready to suspect his own ability to comprehend, his own competency to declare that a corruption must be assumed. The conscientious critic will therefore make it his first business, if he fails to understand a passage, to extend his knowledge in the hope that he may yet understand, and to keep emendation in reserve as a last resort, realizing that the moment he indicts the tradition he may be exposing his own ignorance or lack of discernment.

The proper pursuit of textual criticism is therefore a most profitable as well as a most fascinating employment from the point of view of the critic himself, and it is well that the Classical Seminar has retained the traditional exercises in critical interpretation—with its trinity of disciplines, recensio, interpretatio, emendatio—as an essential part of the training of the scholar. The critic is matching his wits against those of countless generations of scribes and interpreters, with a gambler's chance of hitting upon a truth that they have missed; at the same time he is extending and fortifying his own knowledge in countless ways. If he faithfully works his way through each problem, his own intellectual gain is as great whether he leaves his emendations in the margins of his books or gives them to the world. Publication may be considered a matter of temperament and judgment. The trouble with most of us is that, if we do not subject to a searching criticism the 'hübsche Einfälle' which we jot down as we read, and do not prepare our case precisely as if we intended to submit it in cold type to the court of scholarly opinion, we not only forfeit the chief benefits to be derived from the critical process but are likely to fall into careless and slovenly ways. If on the other hand the critic has the courage of his

convictions and the persistence to demonstrate by a careful analysis of the thought or by a mustering of the linguistic evidence that a passage is corrupt, the publication of his analysis may prove a definite contribution to knowledge, even if his own solution fails to win approval.

Professor Earle's contributions to textual criticism are in the main of the kind that clarify difficulties for others no less than for himself. His analyses are penetrating and the knowledge he brought to bear upon his problems extensive and accurate. He had decided leanings toward the Dutch school of criticism, but he was too strong in interpretation to wish to rewrite his authors if he could interpret without alteration. This is not to say that he always held his hand from a text until every resource of interpretation had failed. One has the impression that he was disposed to publish his lucubrations with undue haste, and that he himself would have suppressed some of his critical notes had he permitted them to lie longer in his desk. But his methods were sound and his conclusions as a rule deserving of respectful consideration. Now and then he proposed an emendation of convincing felicity, and the ratio of his conjectures that will live to those that will go the way of most conjectures is, the reviewer is inclined to think, larger than falls to the lot of most critics. Our Sophocles and our Euripides will always bear the mark of the loving care which he bestowed on them. This he would himself have thought to be reward enough.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

EDWARD CAPPS.

FRIEDRICH LEO¹

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 7.188-190 contains a generous appreciation of Professor Friedrich Leo's *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur I*, and with it a brief note concerning the grievous loss which classical scholarship has suffered in the author's recent death. Professor Leo died suddenly January 15, 1914. His death was not otherwise noticed in the American journals which have fallen under my eye, and I therefore refer to the extended review of the distinguished scholar's career which a Göttingen colleague, Professor Max Pohlenz, contributed to Number 5 of the *Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum*, 1914. For the readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY Professor Ingersoll's discriminating notice of the *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur* forms an admirable characterization of the scholar. The article by Pohlenz deals also with the man. I would add here some words about the scholar and the man, expressive of my personal debt to him.

Twenty years ago, any one who passed the little park in front of the University Auditorium in Göttingen just before the 11 o'clock lecture would have been sure to notice, except in the worst possible weather, two

men walking up and down, engaged in deep conversation. When the clock struck the quarter-hour they parted; one turned homeward, the other to his lecture-room. They were Wilamowitz and Leo, colleagues and intimate friends. That which the casual observer saw had its counterpart in the intellectual realm. The two men not only walked and talked together but worked together in perfect harmony, each supplementing the other. It was a form of coöperation which made itself felt most beneficially. Not to mention other ways, it gave body to a definite doctrine as to what true University work is. The center of their University labor was not the lecture-room but the seminary table. Not what has the student received but what can he do, was the question. Leo as conductor of a seminary was a most stimulating teacher. His mind had a diamond edge; it dealt at its best with the hardest substances. He was not as patient as Wilamowitz, who was wont to give his colts free rein, so long as they were neither pretentious nor stupid. Leo's method was more direct: he did not always wait for us to hang ourselves with our own rope, but often brought us up with a sharp turn. He was a rare intellectual guide. The clarity and precision of his mind were eminently in evidence in the close critical work of the seminary. Textual criticism in his hands had something exhilarating about it. Woe be to the man who failed to respect the boundary between *recensio* and *emendatio*, and who proceeded to deal with the latter before he had settled the former. One who had followed Leo's discussion of a textual difficulty could well agree with Ritschl—if it was Ritschl—who termed the ability to constitute a text "die Krone der Philologie". We were as men standing in an open plain, with the earth beneath our feet and the sky above. We had the facts, the laws of language and the laws of thought. There was no other authority to be regarded in taking one's reckoning. One day after a seminary thesis had been tested and found wanting Leo said by way of recognition at the end: *sed laudabile est dubitare*. This was *skepsis* in its primary sense; for Leo's method did not promote mere brilliancy without regard to soundness. It was rather the embodiment of the Socratic maxim: talk not of who said it but whether it is true.

No scholar needs to be told that Professor Leo was as much a master in the larger work of interpretation as in the technical work of criticism. He loved to know and to determine; but the impulse to formulate and communicate was equally strong. Students did not know him familiarly, but he always welcomed the advances of the serious student. His lectures abounded with clear-cut generalizations that unified our thinking and sent us on our way with joy.

I write this much from a feeling of deep personal indebtedness to Professor Leo; and I write partly because it is well for us to recall in these days of confusion and passion the hospitality which many an American has enjoyed in the German Universities.

HAMILTON COLLEGE.

EDWARD FITCH.

¹It is the settled policy of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY not to print obituary notices: selection among the dead may well prove little less invidious than selection among the living. Professor Fitch's notice of Friedrich Leo, however, is published here, partly for the light it throws on sound methods of teaching, partly for the reason advanced in its closing sentence.
C. K.